

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

By the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1, 34 and 35 have been amended, and new claim 46 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claim 2 has been previously canceled. Claims 24-33 have been withdrawn as drawn to an unelected invention, and Claims 13-19 and 21-23 have been withdrawn as drawn to an unelected species. Thus, Claims 1, 3-12, 20 and 34-46 are pending and subject to examination.

Interview Summary

As a preliminary matter, the Applicants express their appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesy extended in granting a personal interview to Applicants' representative on April 10, 2007. During the interview, the Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed the present invention and the prior art. Possible claim amendments were also discussed.

Summary of the Response

In the Office Action mailed February 27, 2007, claims 36-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1, 3-12, 20 and 34-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimball, "Tracking your department budgets, commitments, and actuals with dimensional model," Business Wire, June 1, 1999 (hereinafter "Kimball") in view of Enzweiler, Albert J., "The 'sizzle' in client/server systems," Management Accounting vol. 77 no. 8, pages 22-30, February 1996 (hereinafter "Enzweiler"). The Applicants note that Claims 1, 34, and 35 have

been amended, and new claim 46 has been added. To the extent the rejections remain applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as follows.

Claims Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 112

In rejecting claims 36-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, the Office Action indicates that these claims “do not alter functionality of the processor based upon any of the features recited in the claims. For example, the process of budget and invoicing performed by the processor is not altered by where the processor is located. The claims are indefinite “because the process performed by the processor is not related to the structural limitations of the processor itself as claimed.” See Office Action, at page 2.

The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 36-45 are directed to a system, not a process. Therefore, the structural limitations recited in claims 36-45 are proper and do not render these claims indefinite.

For at least this reason, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 36-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 103

Regarding amended claims 1, 34 and 35, the Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art, taken alone or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest at least the combination of features of “upon verifying that the budget is within a budget maximum limit, automatically approving the budget subsequent to the verification; automatically creating a work order related to automated commerce for each line item, each work

order specifying a vendor to complete the work order; . . . automatically approving the invoiced price upon verifying that the invoiced price is within the approved work order price or a preset overage tolerance; and automatically initiating payment of the approved invoice price to the vendor,” as recited in amended claim 1 and the similar features in amended claims 34 and 35.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that amended claims 1, 34 and 35 are allowable over the cited art.

Regarding claims 3-12, 20 and 36-46, the Applicants respectfully submit that each of these claims depends from one of allowable claims 1 and 35, and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons.


Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending, patentably distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referring to client-matter number **026083-00005**.

Respectfully submitted,


Juliana Haydolitova
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 43,313

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 715-8469
Fax: (202) 638-4810

JH:cdw